STATE OF LOUISIANA LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR

Remediation for Students in State Colleges and Universities

May 1993



Staff Study



LEGISLATIVE AUDIT ADVISORY COUNCIL

MEMBERS

Senator Randy L. Ewing, Chairman Representative Warren J. Triche, Jr., Vice Chairman

Senator Gregory J. Barro
Senator Willie E. Crain
Senator Thomas D. Greene
Senator Steve D. Thompson
Representative Roy L. Brun
Representative Buster J. Guzzardo, Sr.
Representative Dennis P. Hebert
Representative Sean E. Reilly

LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR

Daniel G. Kyle, Ph.D., CPA

DIRECTOR OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT

Judith R. Brown

Remediation for Students in State Colleges and Universities

May 1993



Staff Study Office of Legislative Auditor State of Louisiana

Daniel G. Kyle, Ph.D., CPA Legislative Auditor

Table of Contents

Report Synop Introduction Structure of H Number of Hi Students Requ	visis vii Ligher Education in Louisiana 2 igh School Graduates Decreasing 2 viring Remediation 3 licies Determine When a Student
Takes Reme	dial Courses
	dial Courses
	Between Colleges and Local School Systems
Potential for I	- Enformance Addit
<u> </u>	
Exhibits	
Exhibit I:	Number of High School Diplomas Awarded
	Over the Last Three Fiscal Years
Exhibit II:	Percentage of First-Time Freshmen Taking Remedial Courses, by College/University - Fall 1991
Exhibit III-A:	First-Time Freshmen Taking Remedial Courses, by Race - Fall 1990
Exhibit III-B:	First-Time Freshmen Taking Remedial Courses, by Race - Fall 1991
Exhibit IV:	Percentages of 1990-91 ACT Scores in Four Intervals 6
Exhibit V:	Placement Policies at Institutions Governed by Board of Trustees for State Colleges and Universities
Exhibit VI:	Placement Policies for Southern University System and Louisiana State University System
Exhibit VII:	Categories of Louisiana Colleges and Universities and Dollars Per Student Credit Hour for Remedial and Regular Freshmen Courses for Fiscal Year 1992-93
Appendixes	
Appendix A:	Listing of Students Needing Remediation, by Parish
Appendix B:	Numbers and Percentages of First-Time Freshmen
	Needing Remediation, by Race, by Institution
	Example of Student Performance Report
Appendix D:	Listing, by Parish, of Number of Students Enrolled in Each Remedial Subject Area D.:

OFFICE OF



LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR

STATE OF LOUISIANA BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA 70804-9397

May 20, 1993

1600 NORTH THIRD STREET P.O. BOX 94397 TEL (504) 339-3800 FAX (504) 339-3870

Honorable Randy L. Ewing, Chairman, and Members of the Legislative Audit Advisory Council

Dear Gentlemen:

On February 3, 1993, the members of the Audit Advisory Council directed my office to gather preliminary information on remedial programs at Louisiana's state colleges and universities. As you requested, the Performance Audit Division of this office is submitting the attached report. It contains the results of our preliminary research into remedial courses taught at the state's colleges and universities. This research was conducted under the provisions of Title 24 of the Louisiana Revised Statutes of 1950, as amended.

The report does not represent the results of an audit and, therefore, does not contain any recommendations or matters for legislative consideration.

Sincerely,

Daniel G. Kyle, CPA Legislative Auditor

DGK/bl

[REMEDIAL]



Office of Legislative Auditor

Report Synopsis

Remediation for Students in State Colleges and Universities

On February 3, 1993, the Legislative Audit Advisory Council indicated interest in a possible performance audit of remediation at Louisiana's state colleges and universities. The council directed the Office of Legislative Auditor to gather preliminary information on this subject. Our preliminary research found:

- The number of Louisiana high school graduates is decreasing.
- Depending on a student's ACT score, the student may be required to take developmental courses at one institution, while the same student could be placed in regular freshman studies at another institution.
- Overall, more than 50 percent of the first-time entering freshmen graduating from Louisiana high schools in the 1991 fall semester were required to take at least one developmental course.
- At 100 percent funding level, the state funding formula for higher education allocates 14 percent more, an average of \$88.95 per student credit hour, for remedial courses than for regular freshman level courses, an average of \$78.30 per student credit hour.
- The Board of Regents reports to the local school systems (public and non-public) on the number of students from the school system scheduling developmental courses in Louisiana colleges and the subject area of these courses. However, the board cannot be certain this information is reaching the individual high schools nor does it monitor any corrective actions taken by the local school system.
- The cost of remedial courses at the high school level is approximately \$51.73 per subject compared to approximately \$266.85 per subject at the college level.

Remediation for Students in State Colleges and Universities

On February 3, 1993, the Legislative Audit Advisory Council directed the Office of Legislative Auditor to gather preliminary information on remedial programs at Louisiana's state colleges and universities. We were asked to compile this information by May 1993. The council showed interest in a possible performance audit of remediation should preliminary information suggest that such an audit would be feasible and useful.

Louisiana's 17 state colleges and universities offer remedial courses in such areas as mathematics and English for students who have weaknesses in these areas. Our preliminary research found:

- The number of Louisiana high school graduates is decreasing.
- Depending on a student's ACT score, the student may be required to take developmental courses at one institution, while the same student could be placed in regular freshman studies at another institution.
- Overall, more than 50 percent of the first-time entering freshmen graduating from Louisiana high schools in the 1991 fall semester were required to take at least one developmental course.
- At 100 percent funding level, the state funding formula for higher education allocates 14 percent more, an average of \$88.95 per student credit hour, for remedial courses than for regular freshman level courses, an average of \$78.30 per student credit hour.
- The Board of Regents reports to the local school systems (public and non-public) on the number of students from the school system scheduling developmental courses in Louisiana colleges and the subject area of these courses. However, the board cannot be certain this information is reaching the individual high schools nor does it monitor any corrective actions taken by the local school system.

• The cost of remedial courses at the high school level is approximately \$51.73 per subject compared to approximately \$266.85 per subject at the college level.

Structure of Higher Education in Louisiana Four separate boards govern Louisiana's higher education system. The Board of Regents, the central governing board, plans, coordinates, and has budgetary responsibility for all public higher education in the state. The Board of Trustees for State Colleges and Universities supervises and manages 10 state colleges and universities. The Board of Supervisors of Louisiana State University and the Board of Supervisors of Southern University supervise and manage those institutions, statewide agricultural programs, and other programs offered within their respective systems.

Number of High School Graduates Decreasing Although the number of high school graduates increased from fiscal year 1990-91 to fiscal year 1991-92, the number of high school graduates in Louisiana decreased by 7 percent between fiscal years 1989-90 and 1991-92. Exhibit I illustrates the number of students graduating from Louisiana's high schools over the last three fiscal years. According to figures from the Board of Regents, of the 39,949 Louisiana high school graduates in fiscal year 1990-91, 15,697 (39 percent) enrolled in Louisiana colleges in the 1991 fall semester.

	Exhibit I
Diplom	ber of High School as Awarded Over the Three Fiscal Years
Fiscal Year	Number of Graduates
1989-90	43,433
1990-91	39,949
1991-92	40,503

Students Requiring Remediation

For the 1991 fall semester, more than 50 percent of the high school graduates from Louisiana's public and non-public high schools required remediation upon entering a Louisiana college or university. Specifically, the Board of Regents reports that 52 percent, or 8,209, required remedial education. More than 53 percent of the public school graduates and about 47 percent of non-public school graduates were enrolled in remedial courses.

Exhibit II shows the percentages of first-time Louisiana freshmen enrolled in remedial courses during the 1991 fall semester by college or university. Appendix A contains the percentages of students from each parish which required remediation at a Louisiana college or university. This information is also further broken down into public and non-public high school graduates.

Exhibit II

Percentage of First-Time Freshmen Taking Remedial Courses, by College/University Fall 1991

(La. High School Graduates Only)

	Public	Non-Public	
College/University	Schools	Schools	Overall
Delgado	65.60%	65.60%	65.60%
Grambling	42.60%	57.10%	43.50%
Louisiana Tech	34.00%	30.80%	33.50%
McNeese	40.50%	18.80%	39.40%
Nicholls	62.40%	53.50%	60.70%
Northeast	62.60%	61.70%	62.50%
Northwestern	49.60%	42.30%	48.70%
Southeastern	54.30%	54.70%	54.40%
USL	51.60%	47.20%	50.70%
LSU - Alexandria	78.00%	71.40%	77.50%
LSU - Baton Rouge	35.80%	34.50%	35.30%
LSU - Eunice	54.70%	60.90%	56.20%
LSU - Shreveport	48.60%	50.00%	48.70%
UNO	68.90%	73.00%	70.10%
Southern - Baton Rouge	80.30%	86.70%	80.50%
Southern - New Orleans	37.40%	48.80%	39.50%
Southern - Shreveport	70.20%	0.00%	70.20%
Overall	53.60%	47.40%	52.30%

Staff Study

Of the 8,209 students taking remedial courses in the 1991 fall semester, 6,708, or 82 percent, enrolled in remedial mathematics; 3,849, or 47 percent, enrolled in remedial English; and 2,600, or 32 percent, enrolled in remedial reading. See Appendix D for a detailed listing, by parish, of the number of students enrolled in each subject area.

Exhibits III-A and III-B illustrate the racial composition of students enrolled in remedial courses during the 1990 and 1991 fall semesters, respectively. Appendix B contains this information detailed, by institution, for the last two fiscal years. This was the only demographic data readily available. The Board of Regents does not maintain this data by other demographic categories. Thus, these data do not consider the student's income, family or marital status, age, or gender.

Exhibit III-A

First-Time Freshmen Taking Remedial Courses, by Race Fall 1990

-	Taking I Cou			Taking al Courses		reshmen Iment
Race	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Black	5,154	69.64%	2,247	30.36%	7,401	100%
White	7,375	41.65%	10,332	58.35%	17,707	100%
Other	677	48.64%	715	51.36%	1,392	100%
Overall	13,206	49.80%	13,294	50.20%	26,500	100%

Source: Board of Regents

Note: Number of students enrolled in remedial courses was calculated by OLA staff using percentages and total population provided by the Board of Regents.

Exhibit III-B

First-Time Freshmen Taking Remedial Courses, by Race Fall 1991

	_					
		Remedial irses		Taking d Courses		reshmen Ilment
Race	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Black	5,525	68.70%	2,517	31.30%	8,042	100%
White	7,806	42.79%	10,435	57.21%	18,241	100%
Other	743	45.84%	878	54.16%	1,621	100%
Overall	14,074	50.44%	13,830	49.56%	27,904	100%

Source: Board of Regents

Note: Number of students enrolled in remedial courses was calculated by OLA staff using percentages and total population provided by the Board of Regents.

Placement
Policies
Determine
When a Student
Takes Remedial
Courses

Placement policies which determine when a student must take a remedial course vary among the state's colleges and universities. The Board of Regents defines remedial courses, also referred to as developmental courses, as those courses which do not give college credit but are needed to prepare the student to do college level work.

Institutions governed by the Board of Trustees for State Colleges and Universities have an open admissions policy which means any Louisiana high school graduate is eligible to attend. The Board of Trustees' admissions policy has three levels of admission: honors level, regular level, and provisional level. The student's score on the American College Test (ACT) primarily determines on which level the student is placed. Other factors considered in student placement are the student's high school graduating class ranking as well as his or her grade point average in certain core courses in high school.

Those institutions governed by the Board of Supervisors of Louisiana State University and the Board of Supervisors of Southern University also have open admissions policies, but do not have the levels of admission. The two systems have similar methods of placing students in remedial courses. ACT scores are key determinants in placing students in remedial courses. Under these two systems, the student's high school ranking and scores on placement tests given at the institution also play major roles in determining where the student is placed. None of the institutions within their respective systems use the same policy.

Scores on the ACT range from 1 to 36. The test consists of four sub-tests: mathematics, English, reading, and science reasoning. Each sub-test has a score and the student receives a composite score for the overall test. Typically at open admissions colleges, ACT composite scores range from 17 to 20.

The average ACT scores in Louisiana have remained at 19.4 from fiscal years 1988-89 to 1990-91. The average national ACT score for the same time period was 20.6. As Exhibit IV shows, for 1990-91, Louisiana students did not do well in the upper ACT score ranges.

Page 6 Staff Study

E	xhibit IV	r
	ages of 1 Scores in	
]	<u>Intervals</u>	
	Percent	Percent
Score	of La.	of U.S.
Intervals	Students	Students
27-36	7	11
22-26	21	28
19-21	25	25
1-18	47	35
Source: Depa	rtment of Ed	ucation

Although the Board of Trustees has a placement policy, the colleges governed by the board have developed individual policies. Exhibit V on the next page lists the policies of these institutions and compares their policies to the Board of Trustees' policy.

According to the Board of Trustees' placement policy, students with a composite ACT score of 26 or higher are placed at the honors level and go straight into their major curriculum. Not all institutions under the Board of Trustees adhere to this policy. For example, Northwestern University admits students to the honors level with ACT scores of 24.

Students with ACT scores of 20 to 25 receive regular placement thus putting the student in general college level studies under the Board of Trustees' policy. Northwestern University allows scores ranging from 16 to 23 in regular placement.

The Board of Trustees' policy for provisional placement requires a student who has an ACT score of 15 or below to take the necessary remedial or developmental courses to bring him or her up to college level ability. Some institutions also use placement tests to decide.

Exhibit VI on the next page summarizes the placement policies of the Louisiana State University and Southern University systems. This exhibit shows that placement policies vary among the institutions in the Louisiana State University System and the Southern University System.

Exhibit V

Placement Policies at Institutions Governed by Board of Trustees for State Colleges and Universities

		ACT Sco	res
College/University	Honors Student begins work in senior college	Regular Student takes general college courses	Provisional Student takes remedial courses
Board of Trustees Policy	26 or higher	20-25	15 or below
Delgado	_N/A	N/A	ACT or placement tests
Grambling State	N/A	N/A	15 or below
Louisiana Tech*	27 or higher	22-26	ACT and placement tests
McNeese University	26 or higher	16-25	15 or below
Nicholls State University	25 or higher	19-24	18 or below (Conditional
Northeast*	25 or higher	18-24	17 or below
Northwestern	24 or higher	16-23	15 or below
Southeastern	27 or higher	18-26	17 or below
Southwestern	N/A	N/A	16 or below

Source: College/University's most current catalog

*Other criteria are also considered such as placement tests and scores in individual subject area.

N/A = Not applicable

	Exhibit VI
	cies for Southern University System siana State University System
***************************************	idual schools have different policies.)
Southern University - Baton Rouge	17 or below in reading 15 or below in English 16 or below in math
Southern University - New Orleans	14 or below in math 16 or below in reading and English
Southern University - Shreveport	18 or below takes placement test. Placement test scores determine need for remedial courses.
Louisiana State University System	(Individual schools have different policies.)
LSU - Baton Rouge	18 or below in English 21 or below in math
LSU - Alexandria	16 or below in English and math 13 or below in reading
LSU - Eunice	18 or below in English and math
Source: Junior Division of the various institutions	

Cost of Remedial Courses

The cost of providing remediation at the high school level is approximately **one-fifth** the cost at the college level. Figures obtained from the Department of Education show the cost of remediating students in elementary and high school averages \$51.73 per unit, with a unit being one subject area. The average cost per student credit hour for remediation at a college or university is \$88.95 per hour, for an average total cost of \$266.85 per subject area (assuming the average course is three semester hours). The cost per student credit hour ranges from \$86.40 to \$90.35.

Cost to Rem Student in On Area	e Subject
High school	\$51.73
College level	\$266.85
Source: Department of Board of Reger	

Elementary and high schools offer remediation to students to help them pass the Louisiana Education Assessment Program (LEAP) tests, commonly referred to as exit tests. Some of this remediation is done for two to three weeks in the summer and some is before and/or after school. At the high school level, a student is remediated for those skills within a subject area until he or she masters them. However, at the college level, a student is required to enroll in a remedial course for an entire semester, though the student may be deficient in a particular skill and not the entire subject area.

Remediation at the high school level has been funded by 8(g) funds in the past. For fiscal year 1991-92, approximately \$4.4 million was used for remediation in elementary and high schools. However, according to an official at the Department of Education, no appropriation will be made to fund this remediation for the 1992-93 school year.

Based on the number of student credit hours and the dollars required per student credit hour, the Board of Regents estimates approximately \$25.7 million would be needed to fund remedial education courses at the state's colleges and universities for fiscal year 1992-93 (if higher education were funded at 100 percent). The Board of Regents also estimates this amount represents approximately 4 percent of the \$630 million for higher education for the 1992-93 fiscal year, if funded at 100 percent.

However, the current funding level is 62.3 percent, thus only slightly more than \$16 million would likely be funded.

The actual cost to provide remedial courses at the college level to those students who are determined to need remediation in order to do college level work is not readily available at all institutions. Some institutions have remedial courses in a single division, while others have these courses established within the appropriate department within the institution. Also, some instructors teach both remedial and college level courses, thus making identifying all costs associated with remediation more difficult.

The formula used by the Board of Regents to determine the amount of state funding going to each institution for remedial courses contains a dollar factor per student credit hour. A different dollar factor is assigned to each category of institution. Exhibit VII on the following page outlines the various categories of Louisiana institutions and gives the dollar factor for each.

The estimated dollars required per student credit hour is driven primarily by the average faculty salaries for each category of institutions as determined by the Southern Regional Education Board. According to Board of Regents officials, the reason why a remedial course requires more dollars per student credit hour is because the salary for instructor level faculty at two-year institutions, is generally higher than at Masters II institutions and some courses are taught by graduate assistants. Also, there are more instructor-level faculty at two-year institutions than at Masters II institutions, thus driving the cost per student credit hour up. The dollar factors are recomputed every year.

Some institutions report a growing number of non-traditional students who have returned to or enrolled in college after several years away from high school. Many non-traditional freshmen require some remediation to sharpen his or her skills before going on to college level studies.

Exhibit VII

Categories of Louisiana Colleges and Universities and Dollars Per Student Credit Hour for Remedial and Regular Freshmen Courses for Fiscal Year 1992-93

		Louisiana Institution(s)	Dollars/ Credit I FY 9	lour for
Category	Definition	in This Category	Remedial	Regular
Doctoral I	Awards at least 100 doctoral degrees; no more than 50 percent of the degrees in one category; at least 10 different programs	·LSU - Baton Rouge	\$90.35	\$81.62
Doctoral II	Awards at least 30 doctoral degrees; at least 5 different programs	·University of Southwestern	\$89.55	\$81.40
Doctoral	Awards at least one doctoral	·Grambling	\$89.97	\$78.40
Ш	degree	·Louisiana Tech	ĺ	
		·Northeast		
		·Southern - Baton Rouge	,	
		·University of New Orleans		
Masters II	Awards at least one master's	·LSU - Shreveport	\$86.40	\$75.62
	degree	·McNeese	1	
		·Nicholls		
1	}	·Northwestern	ļ	i
		·Southeastern		
		·Southern - New Orleans		
Two-Year I	Awards associate degrees;	·Delgado	\$88.47	\$74.45
	offers college transfer courses	·LSU - Alexandria		
		·LSU - Eunice		l.
		Southern - Shreveport		<u></u>
Source: Board of	Regents			

Coordination
Between
Colleges and
Local School
Systems

Although a statute exists which requires the colleges and universities to report the number of Louisiana high school graduates requiring remediation, there is no requirement that the high schools take any corrective action or report on any corrective action taken. Louisiana Revised Statute (LSA-R.S.) 17:1814 requires the Board of Regents, with cooperation from the university management boards, to obtain

... a report from each state college or university to be submitted to each parish, city, parochial, or private school system in the state relative to the performance of the undergraduate students from each high school in that system who are enrolled at the state college or university.

These reports are required to be made annually and to include information on the number of students from each high school in each school system (public and non-public) requiring remedial training and the subject matter of such training. The Board of Regents has assumed the responsibility of disseminating these student performance reports to the various school systems.

The statute further requires the local school systems to forward the report to each high school in that system concerning students from that school. Appendix C provides an example of the report sent to local school systems. The report shows the number of students (by ACT score ranges) who "required" developmental courses and the number who did not "require" developmental courses. However, the report actually shows those students who scheduled developmental courses and those who did not schedule developmental courses. Also, the report shows how many students in both categories finished the semester in "good standing," in other words, not on suspension or in poor academic status.

Board of Regents officials also provide the school systems with a list of contact persons at each college or university along with the above report. The Board of Regents has no mechanism to tell whether the reports are actually distributed by the local school systems to the individual high schools. Further, there is no requirement for the school boards or high schools with a high number of students requiring remediation to take any corrective action or to report any progress toward correcting this situation.

Potential for Performance Audit

As a result of our preliminary research, we found that a potential performance audit could be performed. Some possible objectives could be:

- 1. Determine the number and percentage of students requiring remediation who go on to graduate from college.
- 2. Provide more descriptive data on students needing remediation, such as family income, age, gender, family/marital status, high school graduate or GED recipient, et cetera.
- 3. Compare the costs and benefits of providing remediation at the college level to those at the high school level.
- 4. Determine if the high schools are receiving information on their graduates who required remediation in college and if the high schools are using this information to better prepare future high school graduates.
- 5. Determine the number of non-resident students (out-of-state and international) requiring remediation.

Appendix A

Listing of Students Needing Remediation, by Parish

Appendix A

38.94% 56.21% 57.14% 51.02% 60.26% 50.09% 31.03% 59.74% 73.91% 50.00% 65.69% 58.68% 40.48% 41.96% 41.50% 58.54% 67.50% 46.15% 48.77% Percentage in Remedial Course(s) Total Public and Non-Public 46 24 45 315 18 870 67 111 4 7 32 Requiring Education 71 Remedial Number 230 113 42 224 612 759 56 44 8 8 Number of 82 % 1,737 69 162 121 Students Total 52.78% 27.08% 00.00% 00.00% 00.00% 54.05% 00.00% 51.28% 61.90% 75.00% 00.00% 50.00% 46.67% 00.00% 36.17% 60.00% 35.42% 00.00% 00.00% 31.82% Percentage in 00.00% 00.00% 00.00% Remedial Course(s) Non-Public School Graduates $\overline{\omega}$ 166 0 13 0 0 G 6 0 0 0 S 4 Requiring Education Remedial Number 36 48 0 0 4 0 14 15 459 Number of Students in the Fall Semester of 1991-92, by Public and Non-Public Schools First-Time Freshmen Enrolled in Developmental Education Courses 58.00% 38.94% 42.48% 50.00% 46.15% 51.43% 65.69% 47.64% 41.36% 56.42% 61.19% 57.53% 55.09% 45.00% 79.59% 54.39% 829.99 59.74% 40.48% 57.14% 61.02%Percentage in Remedial Course(s) Public School Graduates Requiring 46 58 704 62 325 302 325 22 22 22 4 17 18 18 42 Education 91 Remedial 4 Number 576 Number of 42 220 56 33 35 73 73 8 113 711 20 49 Students East Baton Rouge East Feliciana East Carroll Assumption (Continued) Beauregard Evangeline Parish/City Concordia Ascension Avoyelles Catahoula Claiborne Calcasieu Bienville Cameron Caldwell Franklin Bossier DeSoto Acadia Caddo Allen Iberia

Appendix A

Number Number Number Number Number Number Requiring Percuntage in Remedial Total Requiring Percuntage in Remedial Total Requiring Percuntage in Remedial Total Requiring Percuntage in Remedial Total Requiring Percuntage in Remedial Number of Remedial Remedial Students Remedial Students Remedial Students Percuntage in Students Percuntage in Students <th< th=""><th></th><th>Public</th><th>Public School Graduates</th><th>duates</th><th>Non-Pub</th><th>Non-Public School Graduates</th><th>raduates</th><th>Total P</th><th>Total Public and Non-Public</th><th>on-Public</th></th<>		Public	Public School Graduates	duates	Non-Pub	Non-Public School Graduates	raduates	Total P	Total Public and Non-Public	on-Public
Rouncing Percentage in Foundary (Fig.) Requiring Percentage in Foundary (Fig.) Requiring Percentage in Foundary (Fig.) Remedial Remedia Remedial Remedial Remedial Remedial Remedial Remedial Remedial						Number			Number	
Number of Remedial Number of Remedial Number of Remedial Number of Remedial Remedial Number of Students Remedial Number of Students Remedial Colo Activity Colo Activity				Percentage in		Requiring	Percentage in	Total	Requiring	Percentage in
right (fty) Studentis Education Course(s) Studentis Education Course(s) Studentis Education Course(s) Studentis Education Course(s) Course(s) Studentis Education Course(s) Course(s) Studentis Education Course(s) Course(s) Studentis Education Course(s) Studentis		Number of		Remedial	Number of	Remedial	Remedial	Number of	Remedial	Remedial
rville 72 53 73.61% 22 11 50.00% 94 64 kson 66 33 50.00% 10 00.00% 66 33 ferson 66 33 50.00% 14 62 31 41 62 31 ferson Davis 146 62 42.47% 0 00.00% 146 62 fayette 553 276 49.91% 120 66 55.00% 673 342 coln 309 168 54.37% 62 13 20.97% 371 181 salle 60 36 60.00% 0 0 00.00% 60 36 coln 161 39 36.65% 39 21 55.00% 60 36 coln 161 39 36.65% 39 21 55.00% 60 36 ingston 49 36 60.00% 1 1 1	Parish/City	Students	Education	Course(s)	Students	Education	Course(s)	Students	Education	Course(s)
kson 66 33 50.00% 0 0 66 33 60.00% 45 33 50.00% 14.26 33 50.00% 45 42.47% 0 0 00.00% 46 87.85% 1,426 812 42	Iberville	72	53	73.61%	22	11	50.00%		64	68.09%
ferson 912 52.8 57.89% 514 284 55.25% 1,426 812 ferson Davis 146 62 42.47% 0 0 00.00% 146 62 ferson Davis 553 276 49.91% 120 66 55.00% 673 342 fourche 309 168 54.37% 62 13 50.97% 371 181 salle 60 36 60.00% 0 0 60 37 181 coln 161 59 36.65% 39 21 53.85% 200 80 coln 161 59 36.65% 39 21 53.85% 200 80 coln 161 59 36.65% 39 21 53.85% 200 80 coln 162 16 0 0 0 0 0 0 disson 27 55.10% 86 42.57% 13	Jackson	99	33	\$0.00%	0	0	00.00%		33	50.00%
ferson Davis 146 62 42.47% 0 0 00.00% 146 62 fayette 553 276 49.91% 120 66 55.00% 673 342 fourthe 50 168 54.37% 60.00% 0 0 00.00% 673 342 fourthe 60 36 60.00% 0 0 0 00.00% 673 342 scoln 161 59 36.65% 39 21 53.85% 200 80 coln 161 59 36.65% 39 21 53.85% 200 80 coln 161 59 36 42.57% 11 11 43 43 43 43 43 43 44 43 44	Jefferson	912	528	27.89%	514	284	55.25%	1	812	56.94%
Rayette 553 276 49.91% 120 66 55.00% 673 342 Courche 309 168 54.37% 62 13 20.97% 371 181 Salle 60 36 60.00% 62 13 20.97% 371 181 Salle 60 36 60.00% 0 0 00.00% 60 36 coln 161 59 36.65% 39 21 53.85% 200 80 coln 161 59 16 42.57% 1 1 10 36 37 18 redison 49 27 55.10% 13 16 88 67 43 43 88 67 47 43 denns 40 67.50% 86 42.24% 112 60 89.55% 17 47 47 denns 44 52.81% 86 42.24% 12 42.24% <	Jefferson Davis	146	62	42.47%	0	0	00.00%		62	42.47%
fourche 309 168 54.37% 62 13 20.97% 371 181 Salle 60 36 60.00% 60 0 00.00% 60 36 coln 161 59 36.65% 39 21 53.85% 200 36 coln 161 59 36.65% 39 21 53.85% 200 80 inigston 249 106 42.57% 1 100.00% 60 36 ddison 49 27 55.10% 18 16 88.89% 67 43 chiloches 223 13 56.52% 130 77 43 achita 36 67.50% 860 432 50.23% 1,986 1,192 achita 36 67.50% 860 432 50.23% 1,986 1,192 achita 29 44 52.81% 0 0 00.00% 47 querriers </td <td>Lafayette</td> <td>553</td> <td>276</td> <td>49.91%</td> <td>120</td> <td>99</td> <td>\$5.00%</td> <td></td> <td>342</td> <td>50.82%</td>	Lafayette	553	276	49.91%	120	99	\$5.00%		342	50.82%
Salle 60 36 60.00% 60 60 60 60 36 36 53 85 80 36 53 85 80 36	Lafourche	309	168	54.37%	62	13	20.97%		181	48.79%
roll 161 59 36.65% 39 21 53.85% 200 80 ringston 249 106 42.57% 1 1 100.00% 250 107 dison 49 27 55.10% 18 16 88.89% 67 43 orchitoches 223 68 30.49% 14 11 78.57% 237 77 tchitoches 223 68 30.49% 14 11 78.57% 237 79 tchitoches 223 66 432 50.23% 1,986 1,192 eans 1,126 76 67.50% 860 432 50.23% 1,986 1,192 achita 354 192 54.24% 112 60 50.23% 1,986 1,192 quinte Coupee 20 19 95.00% 50 28 56.00% 70 47 pides 24 57.53% 23 4 33.33% </td <td>LaSalle</td> <td>09</td> <td>36</td> <td>%00.09</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>00.00%</td> <td></td> <td>36</td> <td>800.09</td>	LaSalle	09	36	%00.09	0	0	00.00%		36	800.09
ringston 249 106 42.57% 1 1 100.00% 250 107 dison 49 27 55.10% 18 16 88.89% 67 43 orchouse 107 64 59.81% 23 13 56.52% 130 77 cchitoches 223 68 30.49% 14 11 78.57% 237 79 cchitoches 223 68 30.49% 14 11 78.57% 237 79 cchitoches 223 66 432 50.23% 1,98 1,192 achita 354 192 54.24% 112 60 50.23% 1,986 1,192 achita 354 192 54.24% 112 60 50.23% 1,986 1,192 achita 25 11 60 53.57% 466 25.2 gides 24 52.81% 28 56.00% 70 47 30	Lincoln	161	59	36.65%	39	21	53.85%		08	40.00%
dison 49 27 55.10% 18 16 88.89% 67 43 rehouse 107 64 59.81% 23 13 56.52% 130 77 tchiroches 223 68 30.49% 14 11 78.57% 237 79 tchiroches 223 68 30.49% 14 11 78.57% 237 79 tchiroches 223 66 67.50% 860 432 50.23% 1,986 1,192 achita 354 192 54.24% 112 60 53.57% 466 252 quemines 89 47 52.81% 0 0 00.00% 89 47 pides 20 19 55.00% 50 28 56.00% 70 47 30 quentines 89 64.51% 28 20 71.43% 476 30 d River 29 26 37.63%	Livingston	249	106	42.57%	1	1	100.00%		107	42.80%
rehiouse 107 64 59.81% 23 13 56.52% 130 77 tchitoches 223 68 30.49% 14 11 78.57% 237 79 teans 1,126 760 67.50% 860 432 50.23% 1,986 1,192 achita 354 192 54.24% 112 60 53.57% 466 252 achita 354 192 54.24% 112 60 53.57% 466 252 quemines 89 47 52.81% 0 0 00.00% 89 47 pides 28 64.51% 28 56.00% 71.43% 476 309 d River 29 26 89.66% 12 4 33.33% 41 30 Alland 73 42 57.53% 0 0 00.00% 69 26 Bernard 118 72 4 33.33% 4	Madison	49	27	55.10%	18	16	88.89%		43	64.18%
tchitoches 223 68 30.49% 14 11 78.57% 237 79 79 eans 1,126 760 67.50% 860 432 50.23% 1,986 1,192 achita 354 192 54.24% 112 60 53.57% 466 252 achita 354 192 52.81% 0 0 00.00% 89 47 70 64.51% 289 68 68 69 69 69 69 69 69 69 69 69 69 69 69 69	Morehouse	107	64	59.81%	23	13	56.52%	l	7.7	59.23%
teans 1,126 760 67.50% 860 432 50.23% 1,986 1,192 achita 354 192 54.24% 112 60 53.57% 466 252 quemines 89 47 52.81% 0 0 00.00% 89 47 pides 20 19 95.00% 50 28 56.00% 70 47 pides 448 289 64.51% 28 20 71.43% 476 309 d River 29 26 89.66% 12 4 33.33% 41 30 hland 73 42 57.53% 23 7 30.43% 96 49 bernard 118 72 61.02% 0 00.00% 119 72 Charles 23 17 73.91% 0 00.00% 138 68	Natchitoches	223	89	30.49%	14	11	78.57%		79	33.33%
achita 354 192 54.24% 112 60 53.57% 466 252 quemines 89 47 52.81% 0 0 00.00% 89 47 inte Coupee 20 19 95.00% 50 28 56.00% 70 47 47 pides 448 289 64.51% 28 20 71.43% 476 309 d River 29 26 89.66% 12 4 33.33% 41 30 Alland 73 42 57.53% 23 7 30.43% 96 49 bine 69 26 26 26 49 40<	Orleans	1,126	092	67.50%	098	432	50.23%		1,192	60.02%
quemines 89 47 52.81% 0 0 00.00% 89 47 inte Coupee 20 19 95.00% 50 28 56.00% 70 47 47 47 pides 448 289 64.51% 28 20 71.43% 476 309 d River 29 26 89.66% 12 4 33.33% 41 30 Alland 73 42 57.53% 23 7 30.43% 96 49 bine 69 26 7 30.43% 96 49 26 Bernard 118 72 61.02% 1 0 00.00% 119 72 Charles 138 68 49.28% 0 0 00.00% 138 68 Helena 23 17 73.91% 0 0 0 0 0	Ouachita	354	192	54.24%	112	09	53.57%		252	54.08%
inte Coupee 20 19 95.00% 50 28 56.00% 70 47 pides 448 289 64.51% 28 20 71.43% 476 309 d River 29 26 89.66% 12 4 33.33% 41 30 shland 73 42 57.53% 23 7 30.43% 96 49 sine 69 26 37.68% 0 0 00.00% 69 26 Bernard 118 72 61.02% 1 0 00.00% 119 72 Charles 138 68 49.28% 0 0 00.00% 138 68 Helena 23 17 73.91% 0 0 0 0 0	Plaquemines	68	47	52.81%	0	0	00.00%		47	52.81%
pides 448 289 64.51% 28 20 71.43% 476 309 d River 29 26 89.66% 12 4 33.33% 41 30 Alland 73 42 57.53% 23 7 30.43% 96 49 sine 69 26 37.68% 0 0 00.00% 69 26 Bernard 118 72 61.02% 1 0 00.00% 119 72 Charles 138 68 49.28% 0 0 00.00% 138 68 Helena 23 17 73.91% 0 0 00.00% 23 17	Pointe Coupee	20	19	95.00%	20	28	26.00%		47	67.14%
d River 29 26 89.66% 12 4 33.33% 41 30 Alland 73 42 57.53% 23 7 30.43% 96 49 Alland 73 64 57.53% 0 0 00.00% 69 26 Bernard 118 72 61.02% 1 0 00.00% 119 72 Charles 138 68 49.28% 0 0 00.00% 138 68 Helena 23 17 73.91% 0 0 00.00% 23 17	Rapides	448	289	64.51%	28	20	71.43%		309	64.92%
thland 73 42 57.53% 23 7 30.43% 96 49 sine 69 26 37.68% 0 0 0 60.00% 69 26 Bernard 118 72 61.02% 1 0 00.00% 119 72 Charles 138 68 49.28% 0 0 0 138 68 Helena 23 17 73.91% 0 0 00.00% 23 17	Red River	29	56	89.68	12	4	33.33%		30	73.17%
bine 69 26 37.68% 0 0 0 69 26 Bernard 118 72 61.02% 1 0 00.00% 119 72 Charles 138 68 49.28% 0 0 0 138 68 Helena 23 17 73.91% 0 0 0 23 17	Richland	73	42	57.53%	23	7	30.43%		49	51.04%
Bernard 118 72 61.02% 1 0 00.00% 119 72 Charles 138 68 49.28% 0 0 0 138 68 Helena 23 17 73.91% 0 0 0 23 17	Sabine	69	56	37.68%	0	0	00.00%		26	37.68%
Charles 138 68 49.28% 0 0 0 138 68 Helena 23 17 73.91% 0 0 0 00.00% 23 17	St. Bernard	118	72	61.02%	1	0	00.00%		72	60.50%
Helena 23 17 73.91% 0 0 0 23 17		138	89	49.28%	0	0	00.00%		89	49.28%
		23	17	73.91%	0	0	00.00%		17	73.91%

Appendix A

	Public	Public School Graduates	duates	Non-Publ	Non-Public School Graduates	raduates	Total Pu	Total Public and Non-Public	m-Public
					Number			Number	
			Percentage in		Requiring	5	Total	Requiring	Percentage in
	Number of	Remedial	Kemedial	Number of	Remedial		Number of	Remedial	Remedial
Parish/City	Students	Education	Course(s)	Students	Education	Course(s)	Students	Education	Course(s)
St. James	73	51	69.86%	0	0	00.00%	73	51	69.86%
St. John	52	34	65.38%	73	31	42.47%	125	65	52.00%
St. Landry	231	116	50.22%	106	46	43.40%	337	162	48.07%
St. Martin	127	19	52.76%		1	9.67%	142	89	47.89%
St. Mary	202	120	59.41%	29	14	48.28%	231	134	58.01%
St. Tammany	486	206	42.39%	104	42	40.38%	290	248	42.03%
Tangipahoa	212	101	47.64%	20	7	35.00%	232	108	46.55%
Tensas	22	20	90.91%	11	4	36.36%	33	24	72.73%
Terrebonne	316	190	60.13%	99	25	38.46%	381	215	56.43%
Union	99	32	49.23%	0	0	00.00%	65	32	49.23%
Vermilion	159	70	44.03%	37	22	59.46%	196	92	46.94%
Vernon	168	88	52.38%	0	0	00.00%	168	88	52.38%
Washington	48	32	% 19.99	14	5	35.71%	62	37	59.68%
Webster	76	37	38.14%	=	1	100.00%	86	38	38.78%
West Baton Rouge	38	91	42.11%	0	0	00.00%	38	16	42.11%
West Carroll	54	21	38.89%	0	0	00.00%	54	21	38.89%
West Feliciana	26	10	38.46%	0	0	00.00%	26	10	38.46%
Winn	40	16	40.00%	0	0	00.00%	40	16	40.00%
City of Monroe	180	100	55.56%	0	0	00.00%	180	100	55.56%
City of Bogalusa	45	21	46.67%	0	0	00.00%	45	21	46.67%
Overall Percentage	12,521	6,705	53.55%	3,176	1,504	47.36%	15,697	8,209	52.30%

(Concluded)

Appendix B

Numbers and Percentages of First-Time Freshmen Needing Remediation, by Race, by Institution

First-Time Freshmen Enrolled in Developmental Education Courses, by Race, by Institution, Fall 1990

u bo	<u></u>	Developmental Course(s)* 669 653 653 120 119 119	Develop- mental Course(s)	Total White	Develop- mental	Develop-	Total	Develop- mental	Develop-	Total	Develop-	Develop-
T M	<u> </u>	Course(s)* 669 653 221 120 120 279	Course(s)				Other		mentai		* I I CATE !!	mentai
Delgado Grambling La Tech McNeese		669 653 221 120 119 279	2000	Enrolled	Course(s)*	Course(s)	Enrolled	Course(s)*	Course(s)	Freshmen	Course(s)*	Course(s)
Grambling La Tech McNeese Nicholls	1,241 367 289 137 333 272 165	221 120 119 279	00.20 %	1,443	899	46.30%	299	227	75.90%	2,713	1.564	57.60%
McNeese Nicholls	367 289 137 333 272 165	120 120 119 279	52.60%	4	2	50.00%	S	3	800.09	1,250	658	52.60%
McNeese Nicholls	289 137 333 272 165	120	60.20%	1,463	404	27.60%	80	25	31.30%	1,910	650	34.00%
Nicholls	137 333 272 165	279	41.50%	1,625	462	28.40%	58	18	31.00%	1,972	599	30.40%
Northood	333 272 165	279	86.90%	1,176	671	57.10%	46	28	%06'09	1,359	819	60.30%
Norması	272	201	83.80%	1,276	685	53.70%	58	25	43.10%	1,667	686	59.30%
Northwestern	165	122	73.90%	941	401	42.60%	153	89	44.40%	1,366	029	49.00%
Southeastern		104	63.00%	2,241	856	38.20%	51	17	33.30%	2,457	776	39.80%
Southwestern	532	448	84.20%	1,859	970	52.20%	128	19	47.70%	2,519	1,479	58.70%
LSU	307	160	52.10%	2,746	818	29.80%	266	92	28.60%	3,319	1,054	31.80%
LSU-A	49	46	93.90%	558	434	77.80%	7	7	100.00%	614	487	79.30%
LSU-E	81	34	42.00%	645	230	35.70%	3			729	264	36.20%
S-ns7	55	31	56.40%	385	112	29.10%	14	9	42.90%	454	149	32.80%
UNO	269	190	70.60%	1,281	648	50.60%	195	101	51.80%	1,745	939	53.80%
SU-BR	1.678	1.369	81.60%	33	\ <u>\</u>	15 20%	14	σ	64 30%	1 725	1 383	80 20 %
ON-NS	453	397	87.60%	7	-	14.30%	4	9	42.90%	474	404	85.20%
SO-S	202	113	55.90%	24	7	29.20%	1			227	120	52.90%
TOTAL	7,401	5,154	69.63%	17.707	7.375	41.65%	1.392	119	48.64%	26.500	13.206	49.80%

Source: Board of Regents

*This column of numbers was calculated by OLA staff. The Board of Regents supplied us with percentages and we calculated these figures; therefore,

these columns may not add up.

First-Time Freshmen Enrolled in Developmental Education Courses, by Race, by Institution, Fall 1991

		Number in	Percent in									
	Total	Develop-	Develop	Total	Develop-	Develop-	Total	Develop-	Develop-	Total	Develop-	Develop-
	Black	mental	mental	White	mental	mental	Other	mental	mental	1st-Time	mental	mental
Institution	Enrolled	Course(s)*		Enrolled	Course(s)*	Course(s)	Enrolled	Course(s)*		Freshmen	Course(s)*	Course(s)
Delgado	1,040	879	65.20%	1,742	859	49.30%	316	221	-	3,098	1,758	\$6.70%
Grambling	1,330	969	47.80%	8	5	62.50%	4	3	75.00%	1,342	644	48.00%
La Tech	336	199	59.20%	1,343	356	26.50%	285	19	23.50%	1,964	622	31.70%
McNeese	282	105	37.20%	1,579	455	28.80%	44	14	31.80%	1,905	574	30.10%
Nicholls	172	153	80.00%	1,071	652	%06.09	41	25	61.00%	1,284	830	64.60%
Northeast	367	313	85.30%	1,340	744	55.50%	54	22	40.70%	1,761	1,079	61.30%
Northwestern	325	235	72.30%	1,064	476	44.70%	23	47	\$0.50%	1,482	758	51.10%
Southeastern	140	104	74.30%	2,291	857	37.40%	63	17	27.00%	2,494	978	39.20%
Southwestern	610	444	72.80%	1,974	586	49.90%	175	95	54.30%	2,759	1,524	55.30%
TSU	290	166	57.20%	2,886	088	30.50%	274	86	35.80%	3,450	1,144	33.20%
LSU-A	53	42	79.20%	565	439	77.70%	6	7	77.80%	627	488	77.80%
LSU-E	89	32	47.10%	869	284	40.70%	٢	3	42.90%	773	319	41.30%
LSU-S	70	43	61.40%	406	127	31.30%	13	4	30.80%	489	174	35.60%
ONO	325	254	78.20%	1,230	999	54.10%	210	108	51.40%	1,765	1,028	58.20%
SU-BR	1,910	1,475	77.20%	26	8	30.80%	21	10	47.60%	1,957	1,493	76.20%
SU-NO	497	482	%00.76	8	8	100.00%	11	2	18.20%	516	492	95.30%
Sn-s	722	165	72.70%	10	9	%00'09				238	171	71.80%
TOTAL	8,042	5,525	68.71%	18,241	7,806	42.79%	1,621	743	45.83%	27,904	14,074	50.40%

Source: Board of Regents

*This column of numbers was calculated by OLA staff. The Board of Regents supplied us with percentages and we calculated these figures; therefore,

these columns may not add up.

Appendix C

Example of Student Performance Report

Appendix C

Ç

LOUISIANA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

LOUISIANA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION BUREAU OF MANAGEMENT INFORMATION STATES	of of cmo	SPONSOR CODE/NAME: 017 East Baton Rouge Parish AMMUAL STUDENT PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR LOUISIANA FIRST-TIME FRESHWAN	NUMBER NOT IN ONE OR MORE NUMBER OF DEVELOPMENTAL DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION COURSES SEMESTER IN GOOD STANDING *** STUDENTS * EDUCATION ** COURSES MATH ENGLISH READING OTHER NONDEVELOPMENTAL DEVELOPMENTAL (1) (2) (2) (5) (FROM COL. 2) (FROM COL. 3)		VERSITY	3	JERBITY -	2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		1 REQUIRING DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION (COLUMN 2) PLUS (COLUMN 3).	ACADEMIC PROBATION OR SUSPENSION AT THE END OF THE TERM STUDENTS WHO COMPLETED THE SEMESTER AND VERE NOT ON
J		04/14/92	ARE GE BLING ACT	1 * g 6 - 10 11 - 15 16 - 20 21 - 25 26 +	*3-LUUISIANA TECH UNIVERSITY NO ACT ! - 5 5 - 10	11 2 18 16 2 20 21 2 25 26 + TOTAL 4	18-NICHOLLS STATE UNIVERSITY 1	TA E	- 8 - 10 - 15 - 20 - 20 - 20	* THE TOTAL NUMBER OF STI IN ONE OR MORE DEVELOP	

LOUISIANA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

BUREAU OF MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS

2										
PAGE		WHO COMPLETED STANDING *** STANDING *** CEVELOPMENTAL (FROM COL. 3)			71 0				10 ENROLLED	COURSES.
		15 000 1000 1000							THE MUMBER	ENTAL AND W
	IE FRESHMÅN	NUMBER OF STUDEN SEMESTER IN G ALL ALL ALL ALL NONDEVELOPMENTAL (FROM COL. 2)			4 -0				7 7 2) PLUS	1 - 10 0.75%
	uge Parish ANA FIRST-TIN	D IN TON COURSES TON COURSES			21.27		- ·		3 Education (column	NUMBER "NOT SCHEDULING" UDENTS WHO COMPLETED THE
High Schoo	t Baton Ro FOR LOUISI 1991-92	ENROLLE CEDUCAT			o -		- -	- .o -	5 LOPMENTAL EDU	Ξ¥\$
0170 Sample	ODE/NAME: O17 ESS RFORMANCE REPORT SEMESTER/OURTER	NUMBER DEVELOPMENTAL TATH ENGLISH	-	-	2 6	•	- - a	- 0 -	8 IRING DEVELC	IN REFERS TO TERM ARE THOSE
CODE/NAME: (್ಷ ೧ ಕ	R ENROLLED IE OR MORE LOPMENTAL UCATION OURSES	-	•	Z† 6	,	4	+-8-7	11 NUMBER NOT REQU	ING ACTUALI
SCHOOL	ANKUAL S	NUMBER NOT IN ONE ING DEVELO ENTAL EDUC ION **	_	i Ersity	b	DUISTANA			7 IS THE NUMB	. *NOT REQUISING A . *STUDENTS IN ROOM A . *SION AT THE END OF
		NUMBER ENROI NUMBER NOT IN ONE OR ME SCORE NUMBER OF DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION ** COURSES (1) (2) (3)		SIANA UNIV		DF SOUTHWESTERN LOUISTANA			5 18 7 7 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	HIS REPORT.
STPOSOR1	04/14/92	TOTAL NUMBER O STUDENTS (1)		L 2 HEASTERN LOUI ACT	M # # - P	COT TY DE SOUTHW	15 20 28 28 4 4	NO RO		
REPORT NO:	RUN DATE :	ACT SCORE RANGE 17-NORTHW	A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	26 + TOTAL 18-SOUTHE NO AC	· * * * * * *	200 ·	11 - 15 16 - 20 21 - 25 26 + 25 TUTAL	22-LSU-BATI NO ACT 1	26 + 107AL * THE TO	** FOR PU

Appendix C⁻

LOUISIANA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

BUREAU OF MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS

_	\$6\$47 W.	হুপ্রসমূক্তি :	D. M. T. W.	in the second	240 EA	ja ningta#	1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	#. day 0	61.7784	Megazili ilin
					8. E MA 8. 2022 8. 2022 8. 1022			AND	TALL MARCH Barrier Dage Barrier Dage Barrier Dage	
က	is n		Market Barrier	- 출생(경) - 11			w via Nej 1		맞소. 4일 1000 - 1000	er 22 et 27
ļ		STED STAL STAL 3)								
PAGE		WHO COMPLET STANDING ** CALANDING ** CEVELOPMENT (FROM COL.		S N	STATE OF STA			중시원 (1982) 2013년 - 1982년	AROLLED RSES. NOT ON	
۵		WHO COMP STANDIN STANDIN STANDIN STANDIN CFROM CO							NO SE	
		WHO ST							COUR COUR	
		ENTS							MUMBER NTAL C AND WE	
		STUDENT ER IN GO EN EN EN EN EN EN PMENTAL							THE MU LOPMENT STER AN	
	Z	AAA COM MARK	- v n	٥	** O =				PLUS OEVEL SEMES	
	五	NUMBER OF SEMESTE NONDEVELOR								
	<u>α</u> _	Ž 12.							N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N	
		មារ មារ ស្តារ		SO	o ∾ <u>-</u>				(COLUMN SCHEDULI MPLETED	
	8 - S 5 - S 1 - S	COURSES								
	σ	2 3							EDUCATION MBER "NOT NTS WHO CO	
School	Rouge	A LED		-	18 4				E B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B	
	Baton R LOUI 91-92	ENROLL EDUCA READ								
High	300 M (COM)		2 4 8	24	17.					က္
- 1	10 388.036668487	NUMBER PMENTA ENGLIS							VELOPA S TO 1	ပ
Sample	: O17 Ea E REPURT		7 B G =	* 2	000 -					
0110	# 55 E	DEVELOR		87)	- 68 C				- 3:3 Z ∨∞ Y :	E.
1	ODE/NAME: RFORMANCE SEMESTER/	Q							QUIRE CLUMN ALLY NDING	<u> </u>
NAME	C See March	OLLED MORE Nyal On S							S CC	Ĭ.
CODE/	SOR VT P	ENR OR SPME (3)		39	9169 6 8 8 3	,			2000 2000 2000	9
	SPONSOR TUDENT FAL	NUMBER IN ONE DEVELC EDUC COU							UMBER N COURS	<u>.</u>
SCHOOL	SPONSOR ANNUAL STUDENT P	NUMBER ENRO T IN ONE OR M L DEVELOPMEN AL EDUCATIO							Z 0 0 v	=
0,	Ž	Z T Z							S T S T S T S T S T S T S T S T S T S T	3
		PERN PERN 2 TEN 2 TEN 2 TEN		40	- 42 - 42 - 42 - 43 - 43 - 43 - 43 - 43 - 43 - 43 - 43				# # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # #	ENS.
		YUMB YELD FDUC FDUC							MENT	JS OS
									SPER	Š
			0.0244	9 * N	*****				DEVE THI	2
90R 1	4/92	TOTA MBER JOEN (+)		•	80 7.7 7.7				25.0 V	
STPO9OR	04/14/92	NUMBER NOT SCORE NUMBER OF BEVELOPMENTAL RANGE STUDENTS* EDUCATION (1) (2)	# 10 2 4 6 - 25 4 3	26 + TOTAL 49 * SCHOOL TOTAL ***					THE TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS IS THE NUMBER NO IN DNE DR MORE DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION COURSE FOR PURPOSES OF THIS REPORT, "NOT REQUIRING" A	Ž
1	1990.78	1 G 2 -1	ACT 20 55 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25	ACT.	1 - 10 46 - 10 46 - 20 24 - 20 26 + 26 101AL				NE DE LE	
¥ L	DATE	A SO S	NO ACT	SCH CTAI					1500 m K K	
REPORT NO	N N	<u> </u>	4 6 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	26 + TOTAL *** SCHODL TO						•
IIX.	22 + 24 € 1 €	. 55° yok (5°)	gent out?	112 NB 12 ⁹	# Pro	ri-keralise.	स्टिक्ट सुन्दर्भ ।	# Y20, 800 To	97 (2000) ·	sip:

Appendix D

Listing, by Parish, of Number of Students Enrolled in Each Remedial Subject Area

First-Time Freshmen Enrolled in Developmental I in the Fall Semester of 1991-92, by Subject Area	nrolled in De f 1991-92, by	evelopments / Subject An	il Education Courses rea	Courses					
	Total	Mathe	Mathematics	En	English	Reading	Ing	BO	Other*
Parish/City	Enrolled	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Acadia	96	84	87.50%	42	43.75%	11	11.46%	12	12.50%
Allen	29	54	80.60%	30	44.78%	20	29.85%	7	10.45%
Ascension	111	83	74.77%	53	47.75%	43	38.74%	30	27.03%
Assumption	46	27	58.70%	33	71.74%	22	47.83%	12	26.09%
Avoyelles	71	65	91.55%	28	39.44%	29	40.85%	18	25.35%
Beauregard	44	34	77.27%	23	52.27%	6	20.45%	9	13.64%
Bienville	17	13	76.47%	12	70.59%	5	29.41%	5	29.41%
Bossier	94	71	75.53%	46	48.94%	27	28.72%	15	15.96%
Caddo	344	270	78.49%	201	58.43%	147	42.73%	50	14.53%
Calcasieu	315	277	87.94%	121	38.41%	58	18.41%	25	7.94%
Caldwell	32	30	93.75%	12	37.50%	4	12.50%	4	12.50%
Cameron	22	17	77.27%	91	72.73%	6	40.91%	4	18.18%
Catahoula	18	11	61.11%	6	50.00%	5	27.78%	0	00.00%
Claiborne	25	13	52.00%	14	56.00%	∞	32.00%	4	16.00%
Concordia	48	37	77.08%	20	41.67%	16	33.33%	7	14.58%
DeSoto	47	37	78.72%	29	61.70%	23	48.94%	7	14.89%
East Baton Rouge	870	705	81.03%	422	48.51%	296	34.02%	209	24.02%
East Carroll	6	9	% 19.99	5	55.56%	2	22.22%	1	11.11%
East Feliciana	51	45	88.24%	19	37.25%	12	23.53%	15	29.41%
Evangeline	79	99	83.54%	51	64.56%	8	10.13%	∞	10.13%
Franklin	81	71	87.65%	32	39.51%	23	28.40%	5	6.17%
Grant	36	32	88.89%	6	25.00%	7	19.44%	က	8.33%
Iberia	115	88	76.52%	09	52.17%	48	41.74%	42	36.52%
(Continued)									

First-Time Freshmen Enrolled in Developmenta in the Fall Semester of 1991-92, by Subject Ar	nrolled in D. r 1991-92, by	evelopmenta 7 Subject Ar	l Education Courses ea	Courses					
	Total	Mathe	matics	English	lish	Reading	ling	Ō	Other*
Parish/City	Enrolled	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Iberville	64	48	75.00%	35	54.69%	28	43.75%	14	21.88%
Jackson	33	20	60.61%	20	60.61%	6	27.27%	7	21.21%
Jefferson	812	979	77.09%	348	42.86%	239	29.43%	16	11.95%
Jefferson Davis	79	99	90.32%	22	35.48%	5	8.06%	2	3.23%
Lafayette	342	298	87.13%	107	31.29%	92	22.22%	81	23.68%
Lafourche	181	130	71.82%	118	65.19%	81	44.75%	48	26.52%
LaSalle	36	34	94.44%	11	30.56%	7	19.44%	3	8.33%
Lincoln	08	55	68.75%	44	55.00%	27	33.75%	16	20.00%
Livingston	107	68	83.18%	40	37.38%	26	24.30%	29	27.10%
Madison	43	37	86.05%	23	53.49%	13	30.23%	4	9.30%
Morehouse	LL	64	83.12%	40	51.95%	28	36.36%	11	14.29%
Natchitoches	62	75	94.94%	50	36.71%	21	26.58%	2	2.53%
Orleans	1192	1003	84.14%	613	51.43%	456	38.26%	95	7.97%
Ouachita	252	210	83.33%	08	31.75%	69	27.38%	17	6.75%
Plaquemines	47	29	61.70%	24	51.06%	15	31.91%	7	14.89%
Pointe Coupee	47		87.23%	17	36.17%	13	27.66%	11	23.40%
Rapides	309	273	88.35%	124	40.13%	120	38.83%	52	16.83%
Red River	30	23	76.67%	20	66.67%	15	50.00%	7	23.33%
Richland	49	43	87.76%	17	34,69%	14	28.57%	3	6.12%
Sabine	26	23	88.46%	14	53.85%	10	38.46%	0	00.00%
St. Bernard	72	89	94.44%	23	31.94%	17	23.61%	10	13.89%
St. Charles	89	54	79.41%	35	51,47%	22	32.35%	12	17.65%
St. Helena	17	14	82.35%	14	82.35%	10	58.82%	8	47.06%
(Political)									
(Commuca)					į				

First-Time Freshmen Enrolled in Developmental Education Courses in the Fall Semester of 1991-92, by Subject Area	arolled in De f 1991-92, by	velopmenta Subject Ar	al Education rea	Courses					
	Total	Mathe	ematics	English	sh	Reading	ng	HO.	Other*
Parish/City	Enrolled	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
St. James	51	42	82.35%	36	70.59%	29	56.86%	23	45.10%
St. John	65	55	84.62%	28	43.08%	19	29.23%	18	27.69%
St. Landry	162	139	85.80%	82	50.62%	29	17.90%	22	13.58%
St. Martin	89	20	73.53%	33	48.53%	29	42.65%	21	30.88%
St. Mary	134	116	86.57%	92	56.72%	48	35.82%	34	25.37%
St. Tammany	248	208	83.87%	94	37.90%	40	16.13%	89	27.42%
Tangipahoa	108	93	86.11%	43	39.81%	30	27.78%	49	45.37%
Tensas	24	17	70.83%	16	82.999	13	54.17%	5	20.83%
Terrebonne	215	166	77.21%	120	55.81%	73	33.95%	55	25.58%
Union	32	26	81.25%	11	34.38%	00	25.00%	4	12.50%
Vermillion	92	74	80.43%	40	43.48%	30	32.61%	26	28.26%
Vernon	88	71	80.68%	48	54.55%	12	13.64%	8	9.00%
Washington	37	32	86.49%	18	48.65%	16	43.24%	13	35.14%
Webster	38	23	60.53%	15	39.47%	15	39.47%	7	18.42%
West Baton Rouge	16	15	93.75%	6	56.25%	5	31.25%	1	6.25%
West Carroll	21	16	76.19%	8	38.10%	5	23.81%	0	%00.00
West Feliciana	10	6	800.06	5	50.00%	3	30.00%	4	40.00%
Winn	16	10	62.50%	10	62.50%	10	62.50%	5	31.25%
City of Monroe	100	80	80.00%	38	38.00%	27	27.00%	5	5.00%
City of Bogalusa	21	17	80.95%	14	%19.99	9	28.57%	8	38.10%
Overall Percentages	8,209	6,708	81.72%	3,849	46.89%	2,600	31.67%	1,401	17.07%
							l		

^{*}Includes such subjects as communication skills and study skills

(Concluded)